

The Catholic Record
Published every Friday morning at 432 Richmond Street, over McCallum's Drug Store, and nearly opposite the Post Office.
Annual subscription..... \$2 00
Six months..... 1 00
ADVERTISING RATES.
Twelve and a-half cents per line for first and six cents per line for each subsequent insertion. Advertisements measured in non-pariel type, 12 lines to an inch.
Contract advertisements for three, six or twelve months, special terms. All advertisements should be handed in not later than Thursday morning.

THOS. COFFEY,
CATHOLIC RECORD,
London, Ont.

LETTER FROM HIS LORDSHIP BISHOP WALSH.

London, Ont., May 23, 1879.
DEAR MR. COFFEY.—As you have become proprietor and publisher of the CATHOLIC RECORD, I deem it my duty to announce to its subscribers and patrons that the change of proprietorship will work no change in its tone and principles; that it will remain, what it has been, thoroughly Catholic, entirely independent of political parties, and exclusively devoted to the cause of the Church and to the promotion of Catholic interests. I am confident that under your experienced management the RECORD will improve in usefulness and efficiency; and I therefore earnestly commend it to the patronage and encouragement of the clergy and laity of the diocese.
Believe me,
Yours very sincerely,
JOHN WALSH,
Bishop of London.

MR. THOMAS COFFEY,
Office of the "Catholic Record."

Catholic Record.

LONDON, FRIDAY, NOV. 21, 1879.

A "VISITATION."

The genial Bishop of Ontario has long enjoyed, both amongst clergy and laity, the reputation of being an expert in temporizing—in fact a sort of Episcopal "Artful Dodger."

His Lordship evidently holds to heart the blending of serpentine cunning with dove-like simplicity. For we see him on the occasion of a recent "visitation" (a rather ominous title), addressing his clergy in a "charge," occupying some hours in delivery, words of sibilious shrewdness and adroit simplicity. His Lordship strikes with one hand—and caresses with the other. Thus, on that solemn occasion (we follow exactly the report of the local press,) after the clergy had with becoming dignity marched from the basement of Christ Church, Ottawa, to the hymn "Onward, Christian soldiers," after they had defiled into lines to allow his Lordship within the "altar" rails; after the "cross-bearer" had presented the bishop with the pastoral staff; after psalms and hymns had been chanted, this worthy representative of Anglican Apostolic succession proceeded to descant on topics no doubt of interest to the churchmen before him. The "charge," though surrounded with such solemnity, was bare of any statistics offering consoling inferences, but contained certain statements which render the "charge" itself remarkable, and the "visitation" which gave it birth, amid hymns, canticles, and benedictions, somewhat worthy of note. His Lordship, as reported by the local press, went on to say:

"But they had had more serious difficulties to contend with than the loss of members by emigration. He meant the agitation caused by such agencies as the Church Association on the one side, and on the other side the influence of societies in the mother church representing things perilously near to Romish error."
"In moderation placing all my glory, While Tories call me Whig and Whigs a Tory."

His Lordship here is an exact ecclesiastical type of that political "independent" described by Pope in these well-known lines. He frowns on the Church Association, shrugs his shoulders at the "societies in the mother church," but strikes boldly at "Romish" error. Here, again, just notice that exquisite, dove-like simplicity, in its sweet commingling with the sinuosities of serpentine craft. There were "High" churchmen attending at the "visitation," there were also "low" churchmen; there were friends of the Church Association, and friends of the "societies in the mother church," but there was not one friend of "Rome" present.

Whence the gentle rebukes on the two former, and the fury wasted on the latter. But to proceed. We again cite from the newspaper report:

"One of the principal points of controversy had been the doctrine of the Holy Communion. He stated that the best means of confuting error was not by protests and denials, but by upholding the truth, and he therefore urged that they should bring before their congregations the

views of the Anglican Church on this and similar questions."

The "views" of the Anglican church! Pray, my lord bishop, what are these "views"? If we cannot have the doctrines of the church, let us at all events have its "views." The "charge" is discreetly silent on the subject. If the book of common prayer have any "view" on this important matter, that view is "perilously near to Romish error." Many Anglican clergymen—and for aught we know to the contrary, some of those at the "visitation"—have come to grief with their congregations by bringing before their people what they—the ministers—considered the "views" of the Anglican church on this subject. How many, perhaps, amongst those his Lordship of Ontario addressed, have suffered grievous material loss, emnity, insult, and persecution, for what they consider a conscientious adherence to Christian doctrine on this most important matter.

These may have looked to his Lordship for light on the subject, but light he gave not. He dwelt on generalities, and temporized with the excesses prompted by the zeal of the parties into which his people are divided, but expounded no doctrine, elucidated no teaching, disentangled no doubt.

In this "charge" he maintained his well-known reputation as the "Artful Dodger" of Anglican Episcopacy, but could not thereby have added to his genuine Christian reputation, either with clergy or laity.

VIENNA AND BERLIN.

We have news of a second visit, within a very brief period, of Bismarck to Vienna. The German Chancellor finds himself at length forced by the cruel march of events to court the alliance and seek the sympathy of Austria. A time there was when the House of Hapsburg had no more bitter foe than this same Bismarck. With Cavour in Italy, and Bismarck in Russia, each in his own sphere, devising every artifice and suggesting every subterfuge for treachery and revolt in the dominions of Austria—it was not—it could not be—a matter of surprise that the latter power had to succumb. But though Austria met with disaster she suffered no dishonor. Unlike that combination of regal perfidy and communistic brutality, the so-called kingdom of Italy, or that morbid outgrowth of ungoverned rapacity and licentious ambition, the new-fangled Empire of Germany, the Austrian Empire has within a few years, recovering from grave national reverses, added to its limits, consolidated its strength, and preserved the esteem of all civilized nations. From the days of Maria Theresa to the overwhelming disaster of Sadowa, the history of the Austrian nation has been till recently but little better than a record of continued humiliations. That generous and intrepid empress, whose heroism in the gloomiest period of her troubled career won for her the support of the gallant Hungarian nation, failed to keep intact the dominions she inherited in virtue of the "Pragmatic Sanction." Her successor, a weak and timid sovereign, left nothing but a name. Would that the same could be said of his successor. For it were better to leave a name unaltered with any brilliant success, than to leave a reputation sullied by the misfortunes consequent upon a fitful and calamitous experimentalism in politics, legislation, and religion. The day of Austria's most fearful calamities was that day which saw her revolt, under the dictation of the Emperor Joseph II., against the authority of the Holy See, and the Catholic traditions of the old Germanic Empire. From that moment her course was downward, and could not be redirected to success without repairing the short-sightedness of the past. Joseph II. aspired to the dignity of a reformer, but his proposed reforms were neither opportune nor far-reaching. They excited commotion without touching abuse. They rudely assailed the most venerated of public customs and institutions, but removed no grievance, lightened no burden, alleviated no injury. This emperor's ambition was to become a successful reformer. He achieved

nothing but the reputation of being the most unsuccessful of innovators. So crude were the measures, so violently unjust the "reforms" of this ill-fated monarch, that public opinion throughout the empire condemned his course. He blundered from one folly into another, till his death relieved the Empire of his disastrous sway. His misfortune should serve as a warning to modern innovators, to the pseudo-advocate of liberty, whose watchword is a "free Church in a free State." Of his suppression of the monastic institutions, a distinguished Protestant writer—Sir Walter Scott himself—is constrained to speak: "The suppression of the religious orders," says this distinguished man, "and the appropriation of their revenues to the general purposes of government, had in it something to flatter the feelings of those of the reformed religion; but, in a moral point of view, the seizing upon the property of any private individual, or public body, is an invasion of the most sacred principles of public justice, and such spoliation cannot be vindicated by urgent circumstances of State necessity, or any plausible pretext of State advantage whatsoever, since no necessity can vindicate what is in itself unjust, and no public advantage can compensate a breach of public faith." No more succinct and irrefragable rebuttal of the stock-in-trade arguments of the church property despoilers, of these our own days of anarchical progress, could be urged. The Cavour, and Rattazzi, and Cairoli of a unified Italy have in more recent days attempted to do that in which Joseph II. so egregiously failed. His innovations, partially carried out, made him a sort of precursor of the French Revolution, before which royalty, imperialism and monasticism were levelled with the ground, and which visited upon Austria especially all the terrors of its most furious onslaughts. After the severe reverses of the Napoleonic wars, Austria enjoyed brief repose. But then came popular outbreaks in various parts of the Empire, culminating in the revolution of 1848. That revolution suppressed, everything looked bright enough for a time, but Piedmontese intrigues soon paved the way for Magenta and Solferino. Bismarckian treachery then led her on to Sadowa. We confess that it was with feelings of some surprise we heard of Bismarck's profers of amity to Austria. The latter is essentially a Catholic Empire. Her policy has not been for a century so much in accord with Catholic teaching as it is at this moment. Her outlook never promised brighter or greater things than it does at this very time. Strange, then to say, is it not, that this is the moment chosen by Bismarck, the arch-enemy of Catholicity and the determined foe of Austrian pre-dominance in Germany, to force himself into the good graces of that power? So long as an alliance with Italy served his purpose he sought every means to build up and strengthen such an alliance, always at the expense of Austria. So long as an alliance with Russia accorded with his avowed policy, so long did he foster such an alliance, always with the most complete indifference to Austrian interests. Can he, then, be looked upon as the friend of the House of Hapsburg? The friend whose friendship has no more solid foundation than expediency is an enemy in disguise. The friendship of Bismarck is of such a mould. Begotten of hypocrisy and expediency, it flourishes in selfishness, but withers and dies with the first breeze of adversity which fans into luxuriance the best fruits of the self-sacrifice of true friendship. But while Austrian statesmen should view with caution, as we make no doubt they do, the proffered friendship of Bismarck, it is not passing probability that they may enter into alliance with him for the purpose of reacquiring the hereditary dominions of Austria in Italy. Plebiscites and conspiracies to the contrary notwithstanding, the territories of Venetia and Lombardy still rightfully pertain to the Imperial crown of Austria. Their retrocession to that power would shatter into fragments that combination of robbery and hypocrisy, the Sardinian kingdom of Italy, the monstrous progeny of

Italian treachery and Bismarckian intrigue. The removal of this reproach to national honor, this standing disgrace to Italian manhood, this libel upon monarchy, were a relief to European diplomacy and a blessing to the various populations of the Italian Peninsula. May not such, we ask, be the result of the rapprochement between Berlin and Vienna?

THE LATE PAPAL ENCYCLICAL.
THE "PHILOSOPHICAL RULE" CONSIDERED IN ITSELF.

ARTICLE II.

There are two classes of persons we must not lose sight of in discussing the late Papal Encyclical: The first is made up of the open and declared enemies of the Holy See, who of course are loud in their denunciations of the Encyclical and its author; the second is composed of learned and sincere Catholics, among whom there are even some ecclesiastics, all of them faithful children of the church, but whose beaten track in their philosophic teachings is not exactly that indicated by Leo XIII.

In order, if possible, to convert the former, and at the same time afford some consolation to the latter, we will now undertake to consider the "Philosophical Rule" in itself, and in its general bearings, endeavoring to avoid all the inconsiderate, indiscreet and distorted interpretations which have brought it into disrepute with some, and made it appear inopportune and uselessly vexatious to others.

The Holy Father undertakes to regulate the study of Philosophy, and that in the manner indicated in his Encyclical "Eterni Patris," addressed to the patriarchs, archbishops and bishops of the whole church. Now, no one will contend that he has not the right to lay down a rule for the study of philosophy in Catholic schools and colleges, especially such as depend immediately upon the patriarchs, archbishops and bishops in communion with the Roman See, viz., the ecclesiastical seminaries, and all those other schools that are under the immediate control of the various religious orders approved by Rome and subject to its jurisdiction. If we consider the nature of philosophy and its manifold relations with faith, we see at a glance that this right is inseparably inherent to the supreme authority of the Vicar of Jesus Christ, and cannot therefore be called in question by any one claiming the name of Catholic. Of this right, many of the predecessors of Leo XIII., notably Pius IX., have made use, and it would be timidity smacking of heresy to deny them such a right, a timidity which in fact has been condemned by the late Vatican council. It is therefore only by stepping over into the camp of the open and declared enemies of the church, who absolutely deny to the Pope the divine authority of Vicar of Christ, that our liberal Catholics can with any show of consistency refuse Leo XIII. the right to meddle with the study of philosophy.

If the Pope had undertaken to regulate the study of painting, music, poetry, mathematics, astronomy, literature. . . our liberal Catholics might to some extent be excused, if they found fault with him for doing so; because these various studies have not apparently as close a relationship with faith and morals as philosophy has. And yet, even here they would be mistaken, for even the study of these is more or less remotely connected with religion; and therefore, the Pope, as supreme guardian of faith and morals, not only has the right, but is in duty bound to watch over them.

In our first article on this subject we have shown how opportune and necessary it was for the Sovereign Pontiff to lay down a rule for the purpose of procuring uniformity in the teaching of philosophy in Catholic schools. But it may be said: *qui bono?* What will all the efforts of the Pope amount to? How can he hope to bring about a philosophic reform in the age in which we live? In the first instance, he will not find even among his own faithful children that energy and cooperation he would wish to meet, and on the other hand the enemies of the Church,

who are very numerous, and powerful in the support of governments of the world, will put forth such a gigantic opposition, as to reduce to naught all his very best efforts. The answer to this difficulty will be given at some future time; for the present it will suffice to say that if the philosophic reform, so much needed by the church, and the civil society as well, cannot be brought about by the authority of the Sovereign Pontiff, then it cannot be accomplished by any other means whatsoever. For the rest, if the Pope had contented himself with merely exhorting Catholic philosophers in general to shun false and embrace good philosophy, without, at the same time, indicating that which is bad and that which is good in such a hypothesis, we grant that this intervention would have proved of very little use, as each philosophic school would still claim, as they have ever done, to be in possession of the true philosophic system. But the same wisdom which prompted Pope Leo to inaugurate the reform of philosophy, suggested to him also the best and most proper means of accomplishing that reform, viz., the establishing of a determined philosophical rule to be henceforth followed in Catholic schools and colleges. Here follows the rule as laid down in the Encyclical "Eterni Patris."

"Therefore, whilst we cheerfully and gladly declare, that whatever has been wisely said, whatever has been profitably discovered and ascertained by anyone whomsoever should be accepted, we most strenuously exhort you, Venerable Brethren, that for the defense and glory of the Catholic Faith, the good of society, the advancement of all science, you reinstate, and as widely as possible propagate, the inestimable wisdom of St. Thomas. The wisdom of St. Thomas, we say, for if anything has been examined with too much subtlety by the scholastic doctors, or taught without due consideration, if anything is inconsistent with the ascertained doctrines of a subsequent age, or, in fine, is in any manner improbable, it is not by any means our intention to recommend it to our age for imitation.

"Furthermore, let masters, carefully chosen by you, strive to imbue the minds of their pupils with the doctrines of St. Thomas, and to place clearly before them his superiority over others in solidity and excellence. Let the academies already established, or to be established hereafter by you, prove and defend this, and make use of it for the refutation of prevalent errors. And take care that suppositions may not be received as truths, nor things erroneous as sound—take care that the wisdom of St. Thomas shall be drawn from its very source, or at least from those streams, which, coming from the original source, still flow clear and pure, according to the certain and unanimous opinion of learned men; but see to it, that the minds of youth are kept back from those currents which some say flowed thence, but which in reality are strange and unwholesome waters."

Such is the "Philosophic Rule" proposed by Leo XIII., in the faithful following of which will be found that scientific reformation reputed so necessary in our days.

And in the first place, our Holy Father declares that the Catholic philosopher shall gratefully accept whatever has been wisely said by anyone whomsoever. From this principle it follows, that that which is certainly and evidently true ought to be embraced, whether it be said or written by a christian or a pagan, by a priest or a layman, by St. Augustine or Thomas, or Molina, or Juarez, or Bellarmine, or Scotus, or anyone else, for the Catholic philosopher knows no school prejudices; neither does he rely on the opinions of any one, but on the mediate or immediate evidence of the truth. This, however, is meant for the teachers of philosophy, not for the young students, whose judgment is not yet sufficiently matured to discern by themselves between true and false philosophy. It would be folly to apply to the study of philosophy a method judged improper for the study of rhetoric, mathematics, natural philosophy, law, medicine, and all the other sciences.

Taken, therefore, in its proper sense, this first part of the "Philosophical Rule" is both just in itself and exceedingly favorable to true scientific progress. It is just, because it does not in the least interfere with the right of human reason to embrace, wherever found, the truth, which is its natural object. It is most favorable to true scientific progress, because it will have for evident result the gathering and preserving of all the scattered treasures of human wisdom. And yet this most wise rule, so perfect in harmony with the requirements of human reason and good common sense, has found a host of enemies both among the pseudo philosophers of this age of philosophical darkness, who would as soon cut their throats as to allude with honor to St. Augustine, St. Thomas or Suarez, in their infidel, government-paid, university schools, and the hypocritical Catholic philosophers, who would reject altogether the pagan Aristotle and the other non-Christian philosophers. Now the rule established by Leo XIII. keeps equally clear of these two extremes, accepting the truth wherever found and by whomsoever propounded, be they friends or foes.

In the second place, the "Philosophical Rule" exhorts the Catholic philosopher to receive and accept with gratitude all the useful discoveries of science, and so once more confounds the base calumnies of those who keep constantly asserting that the spirit of Christianity is hostile to science and that the Christian philosopher refuses to accept the discoveries of experimental science.

It is true the Catholic philosopher is warned not to allow himself to be deceived by the sophistry of our modern, so-called, scientists, who mix up the false with the true, real facts and useful discoveries made by science with false or gratuitous hypothesis which secretly, and even sometimes openly, contradict the evident principles of reason and of Catholic Faith; and all this in order to make the world swallow their false and gratuitous assumptions, as though they were real scientific discoveries.

But the true Catholic philosopher is not so easily deceived; experience has taught him to distinguish between science and the world-be scientist, and, whilst most willing to accept and embrace all that is good and useful in their various systems, he will, with logical acumen, sift all their hypotheses and assumptions, and reject, without human respect, anything that he may find opposed to truth and religion. In doubtful cases he will suspend his judgment and abstain from praise or commendation.

In order to obtain the much needed philosophical reformation, Leo XIII. gives, in his encyclical, directions to the Bishops, as to the sort of philosophy they should patronize in their seminaries and colleges, exhorting them to do all in their power to reinstate the wisdom of St. Thomas; being careful, however, not to confound the genuine wisdom of Aquinas with the sophistical inventions of certain scholastics; instructing them also to be careful in the selection of the teachers for these schools, accepting only such as are imbued with the fundamental principles of St. Thomas and capable of instructing the minds of their pupils in the same, showing them clearly the superiority of his system over all others in solidity and excellence.

As to the masters themselves, they are instructed to study the doctrine of St. Thomas in his own works, or, at least, in such works as faithfully render the sense of St. Thomas, and hold the fundamental principles of his philosophic system, the chief among which are the following:—

- 1st. In corporeal things, there is a two-fold being, viz: the substantial and the accidental. 2nd. There is also in them a two-fold change, the substantial and the accidental. 3d. There is therefore distinction between the first matter (materia prima) and the substantial form. 4th. Accidents are really distinguished from the substance. 5th. There is in man only one substantial form and that is the intellectual soul which is in him the principle of sensitive and vegetative life. 6th. The human soul is the only substantial form which subsists in itself, is im-